

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. SA CV 24-930-DMG (KSx) Date October 15, 2024

Title *James Worldwide, Inc. v. Steam Logistics, LLC* Page 1 of 2

Present: The Honorable DOLLY M. GEE, CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

DEREK DAVIS

Deputy Clerk

NOT REPORTED

Court Reporter

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff(s)
None Present

Attorneys Present for Defendant(s)
None Present

**Proceedings: [IN CHAMBERS] ORDER VACATING SCHEDULING CONFERENCE
AND TO SHOW CAUSE WHY SANCTIONS SHOULD NOT ISSUE FOR
FAILURE TO FILE THE JOINT RULE 26(F) REPORT**

Counsel failed to timely file a Joint Rule 26(f) Report as required by the Court’s Order Scheduling Meeting of Counsel [Doc. # 19], Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(f), and Local Rule 26-1. The Report was due on October 11, 2024.

Instead, on October 11, counsel for Plaintiff James Worldwide, Inc., Justin J. Shrenger, filed a declaration in which he states that due to his judgment that “substantive changes needed to be made to the Complaint,” defense counsel’s decision not to stipulate to dismissal without prejudice so that Plaintiff could bring a new action, and Plaintiff’s intent to move to amend the complaint, the Report was not filed. [Doc. # 20.] Shrenger requests that the Court “continue the current last day to submit the Rule 26(f) Statement and set it at a time after the hearing on the motion for leave to amend and file an[] amended complaint is heard by the Court.” *Id.* at 3. For its part, Defendant Steam Logistics, LLC has not filed any explanation.

Federal court deadlines are not mere suggestions to be ignored at the parties’ convenience. Failure to timely comply with established deadlines may result in the imposition of sanctions. Furthermore, requests for Court action should not be included in the body of a declaration and should be made by motion or *ex parte* application filed and served in accordance with the Court’s rules. Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(b); C.D. Cal. L.R. 83-2.5. Nor should requests for relief be filed on the same day the underlying deadline expires. [See Doc. # 12 at 11 (“Counsel should avoid submitting requests for continuance or extension of time less than five (5) court days prior to the expiration of the scheduled date. A request to continue or extend dates or deadlines that have already expired is presumptively a lack of due diligence.” (emphasis omitted)).]

The Court **ORDERS** the parties to show cause in writing by no later than **October 30, 2024** why sanctions should not issue for their failure to cooperate and participate in a Rule 26(f) conference and file the Joint Rule 26(f) Report, or file a timely request to continue the deadline.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. SA CV 24-930-DMG (KSx) Date October 15, 2024

Title *James Worldwide, Inc. v. Steam Logistics, LLC* Page 2 of 2

The filing of a Joint Rule 26(f) Report, a stipulation to amend the complaint, or Plaintiff's motion for leave to amend the complaint by that date will be deemed a satisfactory response. **Failure to timely respond to this Order to Show Cause will result in the imposition of appropriate sanctions.** The October 25, 2024 scheduling conference is **VACATED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.